

United States
Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Eugene District Office
Upper Willamette Resource Area

ROW RIVER TRAIL ASPHALT REPAIR

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION

Background:

The Row River Trail (RRT), a rail-to-trail project, uses the original right-of-way for the Oregon Pacific & Eastern Railroad. The rail right-of-way was converted to a recreational trail during the mid-1990's. The trail design consists of an eight foot wide asphalt trail side-by-side with a four foot wide rocked trail.

Certain segments of RRT pavement have developed longitudinal cracking that has become safety concerns for the bicycle riders and in-line skaters; these cracks are large enough that a small tire could fall into the cracks and create an accident. A joint assessment by US Forest Service and BLM personnel concluded that the cracking is probably a result of the shrinking and swelling of the clay soils found under the trail surface.

Proposed Action:

Trial repairs will occur on 300-600 feet of RRT in the vicinity of Mile Post 3.8 (T. 20S, R2W, Sec 33, NW ¼). These test repair sections will involve removing the asphalt and placing rock aggregate, sand, plastic sheeting (creating a "slip surface"), and/or a geotextile material (creating a "bridge") and then capping with a layer of new asphalt. These actions are intended to manage the shrinking and swelling below the asphalt, resulting in no longitudinal cracking of the asphalt. After a wetting/drying season, or two, recommendations will be made on how to treat the longitudinal cracking for the entire trail.

All repair work would be performed within the original zone of construction. The Best Management Practices, as described in the Eugene District Record of Decision/ Resource Management Plan, would be employed.

Rationale

The Proposed Action is considered maintenance which meets the criteria for the categorical exclusion as described in Departmental Manual 516 DM 2, Appendix 1(1.7) and does not meet any of the exception criteria in 516 DM 2, Appendix 2. The Proposed Action is in conformance with the "Record of Decision for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl" (April 1994), and the "Eugene District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan" (June 1995).

Preparer -- Jerry Richeson

Date 4/30/04

Environmental Reviewer -- Christie Hardenbrook

Date 5/2/04

Field Manager -- Emily Rice

Date 5/4/04

AFFECTED RESOURCES:

Fishery Biologist -- Mark D'Aversa Date 4/27/04

Wildlife Biologist -- Paula Larson Date 4/29/04

Botanist -- Cheshire Mayrsohn Date 4/27/04

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
EUGENE DISTRICT

1791A
CE-04-32

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW
Exception Criteria Review Checklist

Proposed Action: Row River Trail asphalt repair. Specifics are described on the preceding page.

Review the proposed action against each of the ten criteria listed below. If the project meets one or more of the criteria, it is an exception from categorical exclusion and MUST be analyzed in an EA or EIS. To qualify as a Categorical Exclusion the proposed action may not meet any of the criteria. If the criterion does not apply, indicate "Not Applicable." Any mitigation measures (such as contract stipulations or terms and conditions on permits) necessary to ensure that the proposed action qualifies as a categorical exclusion should be identified at the bottom of the page.

Exception Criteria		Comments
1.	Have significant adverse effects on public health or safety	NO
2.	Have adverse effects on unique resources (i.e., parks, recreation, refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, wetlands, floodplains, etc.)	NONE IDENTIFIED
3.	Have highly controversial environmental effects	NONE IDENTIFIED
4.	Have highly uncertain environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks	NONE IDENTIFIED
5.	Establish a precedent that could result in significant impacts	NOT APPLICABLE
6.	Be directly related to other actions having cumulatively significant effects	NO
7.	Have adverse effects on cultural or historical resources	NONE IDENTIFIED
8.	Have adverse effects on species listed or proposed as threatened or endangered or have adverse effect on designated critical habitat for these species.	NO; SEE ATTACHED
9.	Require compliance with E.O. 11988 (floodplain management), E.O. 11990 (protection of wetlands), or the Fish & Wildlife Coordination Act	NO
10.	Threaten to violate Federal, State, Local or Tribal law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment	NO
Mitigation measures needed to qualify as CE: Completed necessary evaluations for status species as determined by the wildlife biologist, fisheries biologist, and botanist.		

Reviewed By: Christie Hardenbrook

Date: 5/2/04

Above mitigation measures have been adopted and will be implemented.

Field Manager: Emily Rice

Date: 5/4/04